

## Cumulative Table of Cases

### Connecticut Appellate Reports

### Volume 184

---

<p><i>Banks v. Commissioner of Correction</i> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Habeas corpus; kidnapping in first degree; robbery in first degree; criminal possession of pistol or revolver; claim that habeas court improperly determined that lack of jury instruction pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509) concerning intent and conduct necessary to find petitioner guilty of kidnapping was harmless beyond reasonable doubt; whether significance of Salamon factors for making determination of whether petitioner's movement or confinement of individuals was necessary or incidental to commission of robberies that were in favor of petitioner outweighed significance of factors that supported claim of harmless error; whether respondent Commissioner of Correction met considerable burden to persuade court beyond reasonable doubt that absence of Salamon jury instruction did not contribute to jury verdict regarding kidnapping counts; whether question of petitioner's intent in movement and confinement of individuals was uncontested or supported by overwhelming evidence.</i></p>	101
<p><i>Bell v. Commissioner of Correction</i> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Habeas corpus; kidnapping in first degree; robbery in first degree; claim that petitioner was entitled to jury instruction on kidnapping charges pursuant to State v. Salamon (287 Conn. 509); whether lack of Salamon instruction was harmless error; whether properly instructed jury would not have concluded necessarily that robberies were completed prior to movement and confinement of victims; whether properly instructed jury could have determined that movement and confinement occurred during continuous sequence of events that was related to taking of money from safes and was not separate criminal offense; whether question of petitioner's intent in moving and confining victims during robberies was contested; whether movement and confinement of victims constituted continuous, uninterrupted course of conduct that was related to robberies or independent criminal acts that established petitioner's intent to prevent victims' liberation for longer period of time and to greater degree than was necessary for commission of robberies.</i></p>	150
<p><i>Crismale v. Walston</i> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Defamation; slander; malicious prosecution; claim that there were genuine issues of material fact as to whether qualified privilege, which protected named defendant's statements to enforcement officers that plaintiff was trespassing on clam beds and stealing clams, could be defeated because statements were made with malice; claim that trial court improperly rendered summary judgment on slander claim, on basis of named defendant's statement to newspaper reporter, after concluding that statement was opinion on matter of public concern that was protected by fair comment privilege; whether statement to reporter was statement of fact rather than statement of opinion; whether uncontested facts established truth of statement that was absolute bar to slander claim; whether there was genuine issue of material fact as to whether named defendant provided misleading information to Department of Energy and Environmental Protection that induced enforcement officers to arrest plaintiff.</i></p>	2
<p><i>Goodwin Estate Assn., Inc. v. Starke</i> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Foreclosure; whether trial court improperly denied motions to dismiss and to open judgment; reviewability of claim that trial court, in denying motion to dismiss, improperly considered equities and length of time that plaintiff had been deprived of fees; claim that trial court committed plain error in denying motion to dismiss because defendant had not received notice from plaintiff of adopted standard foreclosure policy.</i></p>	92
<p><i>Green v. Commissioner of Correction</i> . . . . .</p> <p><i>Habeas corpus; claim that habeas court improperly dismissed habeas petition pursuant to applicable rule of practice (§ 23-24) without holding hearing; whether habeas court properly dismissed habeas petition sua sponte for lack of jurisdiction; claim that petitioner was being deprived of risk reduction credits; whether petitioner had constitutionally protected liberty interest in risk reduction credits; whether applicable statute (§ 18-98e) conferred broad discretion on respondent Commissioner of Correction to award such credits; claim that commissioner</i></p>	76

	<i>altered discretionary nature of risk credit program by entering into binding contract with petitioner.</i>	
State v. Ezequiel R. . . . .		55
	<i>Aggravated sexual assault of minor; sexual assault in first degree; risk of injury to child; sexual assault in fourth degree; whether trial court properly determined that victim's statements made during forensic interview fell within medical diagnosis or treatment exception to hearsay rule; whether trial court abused discretion in admitting video recording of victim's forensic interview into evidence; whether statements during forensic interview of child that are offered solely under medical diagnosis and treatment exception are admissible if such statements are reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis or treatment, even if primary purpose of declarant's statements was not to obtain medical diagnosis and treatment; whether there was sufficient evidence in record to demonstrate that victim's statements were reasonably pertinent to obtaining medical diagnosis and treatment; reviewability of unpreserved claim that trial court improperly allowed clinical child interview specialist to render expert opinion that appeared to be based on facts of case.</i>	
State v. Harper. . . . .		24
	<i>Conspiracy to commit robbery in first degree; attempt to commit robbery in first degree as accessory; whether evidence adduced at trial was sufficient to sustain conviction; claim that conviction of attempt to commit robbery in first degree as accessory required proof that defendant knew or believed that one of cohorts would be armed with deadly weapon during attempted robbery; whether statute (§ 53a-134 [a] [2]) governing robbery in first degree requires proof that defendant intended to possess or intended for accomplice to possess deadly weapon; whether trial court improperly declined to provide jury with unanimity instruction as requested by defendant; claim that jurors must be instructed that unanimity is required on nature or source of reasonable doubt.</i>	
State v. McKethan. . . . .		187
	<i>Murder; carrying pistol without permit; possession of narcotics; motion for joinder; whether trial court abused discretion in consolidating two informations for trial; whether defendant demonstrated that joinder resulted in substantial prejudice; whether trial court's explicit instructions to jury to consider each charge separately in reaching verdict cured risk of substantial prejudice to defendant.</i>	
Taylor v. Wallace . . . . .		43
	<i>Legal malpractice; ripeness; subject matter jurisdiction; whether plaintiff's claim that defendant attorney provided deficient representation with respect to plaintiff's prior habeas corpus action was ripe for adjudication where plaintiff remained validly incarcerated and conviction has never been invalidated; whether plaintiff had standing to pursue claim that plaintiff was injured as result of defendant's purported fraud on state; claim that trial court abused discretion in denying motion to reargue.</i>	